

ERC Team

Meeting Minutes

Job No. 22192

Written Response Required: NO
Due Date: N/A
Actionee: N/A
Closes CCN: N/A
OU: GW/VZ100
TSD: N/A
ERA: N/A
Subject Code: 8830/4170

066963

SUBJECT GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT OPEN MEETING – MARCH 1, 1999

TO Distribution

FROM Michael J. Graham, GW/VZ Project Manager

DATE March 8, 1999

ATTENDEES

See Attached List

DISTRIBUTION

Attendees
GW/VZ Distribution List
Document and Information Services H0-09

NEXT GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT OPEN MEETING:

Date: Monday, March 15, 1999
Location: Bechtel Hanford, Inc., Assembly Room (Badging Required)
Local Call-In Number: (509) 376-7411
Toll Free Call-In Number: (800) 664-0771

MEETING MINUTES:

A Groundwater/Vadose Zone (GW/VZ) Integration Project Open Meeting was held on March 1, 1999 in Richland, Washington at the Bechtel Hanford, Inc. (BHI) Assembly Room.

PROJECT REPORT:

POLICY WORK GROUP (Dru Butler):

The Policy Work Group had a short meeting today. We talked about the progress of the System Assessment Capability (SAC) and Regulatory Pathway Work Groups. There had also been discussions of forming a work group to support the Hanford Advisory Board Environmental Restoration (HAB-ER) Committee, but we decided to hold off on that for now because we are not sure how to proceed. There was no representative from the HAB at the Policy meeting to shed light on how we could assist them. As the HAB-ER decides what help it needs in a particular area (such as endstate assumptions), we will assist them. The next HAB-ER Committee meeting is March 11.

We are going to change the frequency of the Policy Work Group meetings to once per month. Currently there are no pressing policy issues. The need now is to focus on the work instead of policy. We'll hold the Policy Work Group meetings the first Monday of every month preceding the Open Project Meeting. The next Policy meeting is scheduled for April 5 at 11:30 a.m.

REGULATORY PATHWAY WORK GROUP UPDATE (Bruce Ford):

We have a meeting of the Regulatory Pathway Work Group scheduled for tomorrow. Bob Lober will be providing the regulatory perspective for the Tank Waste Remediation System (TWRS).

QUESTION: What is this work group?

ANSWER: There are certain regulatory guidelines and schedules that the various site projects have to meet in order to close the farms and remove the wastes. We want to make certain that the GW/VZ Integration Project (Project) is aligned with and aware of these.

RESPONSE: It has been suggested to draw a charter for this group. We plan to lay that out in our meeting on March 11.

COMMENT: The Project and Ecology are looking at the same path forward. We're looking at the different projects (facilities, tanks, wastes sites, etc.), what regulatory drivers they are following, and what applies to each.

COMMENT: This appears to be an integration issue with some things regulatory driven and some aspects driven by the needs of a modeling effort.

RESPONSE: That's the crux of the issue. Neither aspect can be ignored to satisfy the other. The stakeholders have certain things they want assessed, and there are the existing regulatory requirements and milestones. The hard part is designing a way to satisfy both without having to run them as separate processes. We're going to have to examine various scenarios to determine the right direction.

RESPONSE: We're trying to scope out the integration issues, understand the systematic aspects, and develop a decision logic. We should have something to share during the Open Project Meeting in a couple of weeks that will say what we will be doing to initiate the path forward.

SYSTEM ASSESSMENT CAPABILITY WORK GROUP UPDATE (Dru Butler):

I believe that everyone here today attended the SAC Workshop last week (February 24). We discussed it a bit during the Policy Work Group meeting today, and the consensus was that overall it was a success. There was a great deal of discussion during the early part of the SAC meeting about uncertainty. As a result, another meeting has been scheduled for this upcoming Wednesday (March 3) that will focus on uncertainty. Dirk Dunning from the Oregon Office of Energy (ODOE) will be helping out by talking for about an hour on the components of uncertainty. Charley Kincaid, Pam Doctor, Charlie Cole, Paul Eslinger, and Alan Brothers will also lead discussions on various aspects of uncertainty as it applies to the SAC. The meeting is scheduled from 8 a.m. to 2 p.m. to allow people to attend the Ecology Open House scheduled that afternoon in Kennewick.

COMMENT: From looking at the list of expected attendees, the one thing missing seems to be the uncertainty expertise from the people that prepared the Retrieval Performance Evaluation (RPE). The only reason that threw up a flag for me was that they have expertise in this arena.

RESPONSE: The list of expected attendees was compiled from the people that expressed interest from last week's SAC meeting. Do you think it would be useful to get a presentation on the RPE?

COMMENT: Part of the focus of this upcoming meeting is trying to understand what uncertainty is and how it effects the SAC. That ties into the early work by Jacobs Engineering with the RPE. It's possible they could help.

COMMENT: We definitely should have them here for this meeting.

RESPONSE: We'll get in touch with them and make sure they know we would like them to participate.

RESPONSE: Bob Boutin and I (Bob Bryce) talked earlier today and discussed involving them. That would be fine.

QUESTION: What are the future plans for the SAC Working Group?

ANSWER: Coming out of the Regulatory Meeting on February 9, we were planning to reconvene the SAC Work Group, but we decided to put it off until after the workshop on February 24. We are viewing this upcoming meeting on uncertainty as a restart for the SAC Work Group. There were several issues defined in the February 9 meeting for the SAC Work Group to address. One of the top issues was uncertainty.

RESPONSE: The group will keep an ongoing list of issues and how the group is addressing those issues.

TWRS CHARACTERIZATION PLANNING UPDATE (David Olson):

The Data Quality Objective (DQO) meetings are ongoing for the S/SX characterization preliminary planning. We are meeting every Tuesday and Thursday from now until the end of March. We are not into the new characterization. We are examining the 41-39 borehole decommissioning plans and the tie into the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) monitoring wells. We should be finishing up with that tomorrow and then getting into the new boreholes for field work planned this summer. After that, we'll start discussing the RCRA Facility Investigation/Corrective Measures Study (RFI/CMS) workplan for the single shelled tanks (SSTs). There are a ton of people involved in these meetings, and we're just trying to make sure everyone has their say.

QUESTION: Who are some of the people involved?

ANSWER: Terri Stewart and John Zachara are in from PNNL. Tony Knepp is involved from the GW/VZ Project. Wade Riggsbee and Stan Sobczyk are participating from the Tribes. ODOE was there for one meeting, and we've had heavy participation from Ecology. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has not participated yet.

QUESTION: What is this borehole that's being decommissioned?

ANSWER: It's being used as a groundwater monitoring well now. PNNL is doing the final sampling from it this week.

QUESTION: Are you planning to gather any data during the decommission process?

ANSWER: We'll probably seal off the bottom section and take samples on the way up as it is collapsed.

QUESTION: So this well is being shut down?

ANSWER: Yes.

QUESTION: What if you need additional data ten, twenty, or thirty years from now? Isn't this a potential data source lost?

ANSWER: The concern is that if you leave it intact, even if it is sealed, it is a potential pathway for contamination. It has been discussed, and it was thought to be safer to just take it out of service.

QUESTION: Aren't you afraid you might miss out on something by closing down this data source?

ANSWER: More data is actually gained by physically moving through an area. The only data on the vadose zone to be gained now is from spectral gamma logging. We are going to attempt to collect physical samples as we move back through the well while collapsing it. We can send the soil samples back to the lab to be worked on and pinpoint the contaminants that are there. We can also use this as a tool to indicate how accurate the spectral gamma data is.

QUESTION: Is this right next to another active borehole?

ANSWER: Yes. It's fairly close.

COMMENT: There are a lot of people with differing technical backgrounds actively involved with this. They have sorted out a few different sample locations with a lot of different technical objectives. Even with all the different representation, the progress has been good. The lingering issues of where the contamination is, what it is, where it's going, and how fast it's getting there are still out there.

QUESTION: Will this help us understand the other areas? There are 1200 or so operable units and we have been focusing our resources on the worst of those. I agree with focusing on the worst 200, but what about the other 1000?

ANSWER: The cavalier answer is to ask the budget people. As of right now, it's below the line in the fiscal year 2001 (FY01) budget. We'll just work with what we have to determine how the unique, hostile fluids in the Hanford system interact with the environment. By focusing on the worst sites, we'll get data on the way the contaminants react in general, which should also apply to the other units we're not working on actively right now.

COMMENT: The Expert Panel will have a sub-panel here on March 22-23. They will be reviewing progress on the preliminary S/SX plan and on field collection/data gathering. This will be an open meeting, but there is not an agenda yet. There is one more Open Project Team meeting before then on March 15. We'll pass out an agenda then.

QUESTION: This will be a two-day meeting?

ANSWER: That's the plan. We'll get it on the Project calendar.

QUESTION: There is a DQO meeting scheduled that day. Will that still be held?

ANSWER: Yes. By then we will have moved from the preliminary S/SX plan to the RFI/CMS. We can run those concurrently.

COMMENT: The Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Change Package has us doing the RFI/CMS for all of the SSTs together after review of the S/SX characterization plan. The S/SX is an expedited effort. It's sort of uncoupled from the RFI/CMS right now. The plan for the meetings is to go for a preliminary S/SX workplan first. The second phase is the RFI/CMS for the SSTs. Then we'll go back for the next iteration of the S/SX plan. That's why we're calling this a preliminary plan. It's just a scoping iteration.

QUESTION: Shouldn't you put off the DQO meeting that is scheduled to be held while the sub-panel is here?

ANSWER: It's a scheduling thing. We have milestones to meet, and the process needs to continue as planned. Since it can't be put off, we'll just run it concurrent to the sub-panel meeting. They shouldn't really conflict.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD (DNFSB) BRIEFING (Tom Wintczak):

Steve Stokes from the DNFSB was here last week, and the Project had four hours with him. We briefed him on the GW/VZ Integration Project overall. Charley Kincaid and Marcel Bergeron talked about the composite analysis. Fred Mann talked about the performance assessment. We wanted to communicate what it is we're attempting to integrate. What are the decisions, when do they need to be made, and what information do we need to get in order to support those? It was mostly an information exchange. He was just interested in the process. It wasn't intended to be too in depth.

COMMENT: The general feedback that Stokes gave to Mike Hughes was that his impression was favorable. We're waiting now for his written comments.

QUESTION: Could you please distribute those comments when they are available?

ANSWER: Yes.

HANFORD COMMUNITIES CAUCUS PRESENTATION (Tom Wintczak):

The Project gave a presentation to the Hanford Communities Administrative Board on February 26. The Board is composed of representatives from local communities and governments. They were interested in what the GW/VZ Integration Project is, what it does, and whether or not it's worth the money. In terms of the money, we communicated the need for this Project, but also the need for characterization. We can't be successful without both. They have to be hand-in-hand. We had the opportunity to look at the overall site budget and priorities as well. Gordon Rogers from the HAB is involved with the Caucus, and he was kind enough to give his view of the Project.

There are similar community boards across the country for communities impacted by DOE facilities. They meet once a year for a conference, and this year they are planning to hold the conference in the Tri-Cities sometime in mid-September. There is no agenda yet, but we will try to get it out when we have it.

GENERAL COMMENTS:

COMMENT: (Steve Sautter) I would just like to thank the Project again for meeting with ODOE and our activists last month. I just want to reiterate how extremely beneficial it was to have the chance to sit down around the table and talk one-on-one. It helped to dismiss rumors and get the facts. The feedback here in Oregon has been nothing but excellent.

RESPONSE: That format seems to work better than the big formal workshops we've done in the past. We are in the process of trying to set up something similar with the Tribal Nations. We have a meeting in the works with the League of Women's Voters, and we're also trying to get meetings set up with other interested groups from western Washington.

ACTIONS:

- Distribute an agenda for the Expert Panel sub-panel on March 22-23 at the Open Project Team meeting on March 15.
- Distribute written comments from the DNFSB briefing when they are available.

UPCOMING EVENTS:

(See attached 6-Week Look Ahead Calendar)

NOTES:

GW/VZ Web Site location: <http://www.bhi-erc.com/vadose>

If you have questions or comments please contact Dru Butler (509-375-4669), Gary Jewell (509-372-9192), or Karen Strickland (509-372-9236)

ATTACHMENTS:

- 1) 6-Week Look Ahead Calendar

ATTENDEES:

Martin Bensky, Tri-Cities Caucus

Bob Boutin, BHI

Bob Bryce, PNNL

Dru Butler, BHI

Dib Goswami, Ecology

Mary Harmon, DOE-HQ

Barbara Harper, YIN

Fred Mann, FDNW

Dave Olson, DOE-RL

Tom Page, PNNL

Wade Riggsbee, YIN

Virginia Rohay, CHI

Steve Sautter, ODOE

Herb Sutter, DOE-HQ

Terri Stewart, PNNL

Mike Thompson, DOE-RL

John Williams, FDH

Tom Wintczak, BHI

ATTACHMENT 1

GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT
MARCH 8, 1999 – MAY 27, 1999
TWO MONTH LOOK AHEAD CALENDAR

March 9	DQO Meetings - SST RFI/CMS Workplan (BHI Room 1B40 – 8 a.m. to Noon)
March 9	GW/VZ briefing to the Army Corps of Engineers (Walla Walla)
March 9	FY01 Budget Development Process Meeting (Portland)
March 10	FY01 Budget Development Process Meeting (Seattle)
March 11	DQO Meetings - SST RFI/CMS Workplan (BHI Room 1B40 – 8 a.m. to Noon)
March 11	HAB-ER Committee Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 9 a.m.-4 p.m.)
March 11	Regulatory Pathway Work Group Meeting (BHI Room 1B40 – 1-2 p.m.)
March 11	FY01 Budget Development Process Meeting (Spokane)
March 15	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m.)
March 16	DQO Meetings - SST RFI/CMS Workplan (BHI Room 1B40 – 8 a.m. to Noon)
March 18	DQO Meetings - SST RFI/CMS Workplan (BHI Room 1B40 – 8 a.m. to Noon)
March 18	Regulatory Pathway Work Group Meeting (BHI Room 1B40 – 1-2 p.m.)
March 22-23	GW/VZ Expert Panel – TWRS-SX Sub Panel (Richland)
March 23	DQO Meetings - SST RFI/CMS Workplan (BHI Room 1B40 – 8 a.m. to Noon)
March 24	TPA Public Involvement Quarterly Meeting (Richland – Tower Inn – 1-3 p.m.)
March 25	DQO Meetings - SST RFI/CMS Workplan (BHI Room 1B40 – 8 a.m. to Noon)
March 25-26	Hanford Advisory Board Meeting (Richland – Tower Inn)
March 30	DQO Meetings - SST RFI/CMS Workplan (BHI Room 1B40 – 8 a.m. to Noon)
March 30-31	Oregon Hanford Waste Board Meeting (Ontario, OR) (GW/VZ on agenda for 3/31)
April 1	Regulatory Pathway Work Group Meeting (BHI Room 1B40 – 1-2 p.m.)
April 5	GW/VZ Policy Work Group Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 11:30 a.m.-12:45 p.m.)
April 5	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m.)
April 8	Regulatory Pathway Work Group Meeting (BHI Room 1B40 – 1-2 p.m.)
April 15	HAB-ER Committee Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 9 a.m.-4 p.m.)
April 19	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m.)

April 19-21	Environmental Toxicology & Risk Assessment-Environmental Fate and Transport Symposium, ASTM (Seattle)
April 22	Regulatory Pathway Work Group Meeting (BHI Room 1B40 – 1-2 p.m.)
April 29	Regulatory Pathway Work Group Meeting (BHI Room 1B40 – 1-2 p.m.)
May 3	GW/VZ Policy Work Group Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 11:30 a.m.-12:45 p.m.)
May 3	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m.)
May 4-6	TechCon/ITRD Forum on Reducing Surface Infiltration Around the Hanford Tanks (Cavanaugh's, Kennewick) Contact: David Olson
May 6	Regulatory Pathway Work Group Meeting (BHI Room 1B40 – 1-2 p.m.)
May 13	HAB-ER Committee Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 9 a.m.-4 p.m.)
May 13-15	GW/VZ Expert Panel meetings (BHI Assembly Room)
May 17	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting (Richland – BHI Assembly Room – 1 p.m.)
May 20	Regulatory Pathway Work Group Meeting (BHI Room 1B40 – 1-2 p.m.)
May 27	Regulatory Pathway Work Group Meeting (BHI Room 1B40 – 1-2 p.m.)

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIODS

March 12	GW/VZ Project Specification public comment period ends
April 1	Proposed TPA Change Package for SST Groundwater and Vadose Zone Characterization public comment period ends